BEFORE THE APPEALS BOARD FOR THE KANSAS DIVISION OF WORKERS COMPENSATION

DOROTHY SHELBY) Claimant)	
VS.	Docket No. 180,215
THE BOEING COMPANY - WICHITA	DOCKET NO. 160,213
Respondent) AND)	
AETNA CASUALTY & SURETY COMPANY))
Insurance Carrier) AND)	
KANSAS WORKERS COMPENSATION FUND	

ORDER

Respondent appeals from an Award rendered by John D. Clark on March 20, 1995. The Appeals Board heard oral argument July 26, 1995.

APPEARANCES

Respondent and its insurance carrier appeared by and through their attorney Vaughn Burkholder of Wichita, Kansas. The Kansas Workers Compensation Fund appeared by and through its attorney John C. Nodgaard, Wichita, Kansas. There were no other appearances.

RECORD AND STIPULATIONS

The Appeals Board has reviewed and considered the record listed in the Award. The Appeals Board also adopts the stipulations listed in the Award.

Issues

The sole issue to be considered on appeal is whether all or any portion of the Award should be assessed against the Kansas Workers Compensation Fund.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

After reviewing the record and considering the arguments, the Appeals Board finds that none of the Award should be assessed against the Workers Compensation Fund. The decision by the Administrative Law Judge should be affirmed.

Issues between respondent and claimant were settled at a hearing held September 30, 1993. The issues between the Fund and respondent were, thereafter, litigated and submitted to the Administrative Law Judge for decision. The Administrative Law Judge entered an Award on March 20, 1995 finding that the Workers Compensation Fund was not liable for any portion of the Award.

The present claim involves injury to claimant's right shoulder and right upper extremity during the period April 16, 1991 to April 16, 1992. Claimant had injured her left shoulder in 1988. The condition in her left shoulder was diagnosed as chronic bursitis with a frozen left shoulder. Respondent contends that it retained claimant in its employ with knowledge of a preexisting handicap, the 1988 injury, and further contends that the injury to the right shoulder in 1991 would not have occurred but for the injury to the left. Respondent, therefore, asks for a hundred percent (100%) reimbursement from the Fund for all amounts paid in this claim.

There is no real disagreement that respondent had knowledge of claimant's 1988 injury and resulting impairment. The dispute here focuses instead on whether the 1988 injury to the left shoulder had a significant relationship to the injury on the right.

Respondent rests its argument largely on the history reflected in the Boeing Central Medical records. The records of April 30, 1991 state: "Left shoulder froze up 2 to 3 years ago, since then has used the right arm and shoulder do [sic] most of the work." The Appeals Board finds, however, the history in the records is outweighed by claimant's testimony to the contrary. Claimant testified that after the injury in 1988, she underwent approximately two (2) weeks of physical therapy after which she did not have any significant problems, had no restrictions and was essentially pain free. She insisted the injury in 1988 did not alter the manner of her work. She further states that she is right-hand dominant and tended to do most of her work on her right regardless of the injury to the left. Finally, she describes the injury in 1991 as having started with a specific event on April 16, 1991 when a bur caught, the tool she was operating flipped, and her shoulder popped.

There is, in fact, a confusing inconsistency between the history reflected in the records and claimant's testimony. The Appeals Board, however, finds claimant's testimony convincing. The Appeals Board, therefore, finds that the 1991 injury to the right shoulder would have occurred regardless of the injury to the left and further finds that the injury to the left shoulder did not contribute to the disability resulting from the 1991 injury.

AWARD

WHEREFORE, it is the finding, decision, and order of the Appeals Board that the Award of Administrative Law Judge John D. Clark dated March 20, 1995 should be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this ____ day of August, 1995.

BOARD MEMBER
BOARD MEMBER
BOARD MEMBER

c: Vaughn Burkholder, Wichita, Kansas John C. Nodgaard, Wichita, Kansas John D. Clark, Administrative Law Judge Philip S. Harness, Director